

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1 and 5 and leaves claims 2-4 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-5.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over LeComte (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0026636) in view of Nobuyoshi (JP 2002-24330). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 1-5 are not taught or suggested by LeComte or Nobuyoshi whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to recite that the present invention is directed to a video data distribution system and a video data distribution method implemented in the video data distribution system for distributing video data through a network.

According to the present invention the video data distribution system includes a mobile equipment including at least one image pick-up mobile with an image pick-up device for generating and wirelessly transmitting video data picked up by the image pick-up device, an authentication server unit having an authentication table for authenticating the image pick-up mobile when a wireless connection is to be established between the mobile equipment and the video storage/distribution device, a data converter for converting the video data generated by the image pick-up mobile into video data of a

predetermined type for storing, and a video storage/distribution device for storing the video data of the predetermined type transmitted from the mobile equipment authorized by the authorization table.

According to the present invention the video data of the predetermined types stored in the video storage/distribution device is distributed to the mobile equipment based on a distribution request from the mobile equipment.

Further, according to the present invention the video storage/distribution device is connected to the authentication server unit and the data converter, and when the mobile equipment wirelessly transmits the video data picked up by the image pick-up device, the video storage/distribution device establishes the wireless connected between the mobile equipment and the video storage/distribution device.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by LeComte or Nobuyoshi whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

LeComte teaches a video interfacing arrangement 1 for connecting at least one display device 2 to at least one video source 3, 5, 11, 12 or 14. As illustrated, for example, in Fig. 1 of LeComte the video interface arrangement 1 provides switching functions between display devices 2 and one or more of the video sources 3, 5, 11, 12 and 14. The video interfacing arrangement 1 can also receive multi-media data via a network 16 and network interface 16'

from a portal server 4 which is connected to a plurality of multi-media servers 3. The multi-media servers 3 can provide multi-media content including, for example, multi-media content provided by a satellite 5.

However, the video interfacing arrangement as taught by LeComte is entirely different from that of the present invention. Namely, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in LeComte of a mobile equipment including at least one image pick-up mobile with an image pick-up device for generating and wirelessly transmitting video data picked up by the image pick-up device as in the present invention as recited in the claims. All of the video sources as taught by LeComte and as illustrated, for example, in Figs. 1 and 2 thereof are connected by wire via an interface 7, 7', 8, 8', 9, 10, 14' and 15' to the video interfacing arrangement 1. It should be noted that element 10 as illustrated in Fig. 1 of LeComte is a user communication and controlling interface and element 13 is a remote control interface. Thus, elements 10 and 13 are not mobile equipment having an image pick-up mobile with an image pick-up device as recited in the claims.

Further, it should be noted that element 5 as illustrated in Fig. 2 is described as a satellite station which broadcasts VHS television which is received by a disk antenna 5'. Thus, elements 5 and 5' as taught by LeComte do not correspond to the mobile equipment having an image pick-up mobile with an image pick-up device as recited in the claims.

Even further, there is no teaching or suggestion in LeComte that the video storage/distribution device is connected to the authentication server and the data converter and that when the mobile equipment wirelessly transmits the video data picked up by the image pick-up device, the video

storage/distribution device establishes a wireless connection between the mobile equipment and the video storage/distribution device as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Even further still, there is no teaching or suggestion in LeComte that the authentication server unit authenticates the image pick-up mobile included in the mobile equipment when a wireless connection is to be established between the mobile equipment and the video storage/distribution device as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Thus, LeComte fails to teach or suggest a mobile equipment including at least one image pick-up mobile with an image pick-up for generating and wirelessly transmitting video data picked-up by the image pick-up device as recited in the claims.

Further, LeComte fails to teach or suggest an authentication server unit having an authentication table for authenticating the image pick-up mobile when a wireless connection is to be established between the mobile equipment and the video storage/distribution device as recited in the claims.

Still further, LeComte fails to teach or suggest that the video storage/distribution device is connected to the authentication server unit and the data converter and that when the mobile equipment wirelessly transmits the video data picked up by the image pick-up device, the video storage/distribution device establishes the wireless connection between the mobile equipment and the video storage/distribution device as recited in the claims.

The above described deficiencies of LeComte are not supplied by any of the other references of record. Particularly, the above described deficiencies of LeComte are not supplied by Nobuyoshi.

Nobuyoshi is merely relied by the Examiner for an alleged teaching that the mobile equipment includes at least one image pick-up mobile with an image pick-up device for generating and transmitting video data. However, Nobuyoshi does not teach or suggest the above described features of the present invention wherein the video storage/distribution device wirelessly establishes a connection between mobile equipment and the video storage/distribution device and that authentication is performed when the mobile equipment wirelessly transmits video data to the video storage/distribution device thereby establishing a wireless connection between the mobile equipment and the video storage/distribution device as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Thus, Nobuyoshi, the same as LeComte, fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings of LeComte with Nobuyoshi in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims and as such does not render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 1-5 as being unpatentable over LeComte in view of Nobuyoshi is respectfully requested.


The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-5.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of the present application based on claims 1-5 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.43533X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120